1		
2		
3		
4		
5		ACTED ACT. COLUMN
6	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT TACOMA	
7		
8	GEOFFREY ROBERT LAWSON,	ı
9	Plaintiff,	CASE NO. C10-5481 BHS
10	V.	ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR RELIEF
11	OCWEN LOAN SERVICING, LLC, et	
12	al.,	
13	Defendants.	
14		
15	This matter comes before the Court on Plaintiff Geoffrey Robert Lawson's	
16	("Lawson") motion for relief from order of dismissal (Dkt. 86).  On February 10, 2012, the Court dismissed Lawson's complaint because he failed to participate in discovery and failed to respond to the Court's order to show cause. Dkt.	
17		
18	85. On January 25, 2013, Lawson filed a motion for relief from the dismissal order	
19	because of excusable neglect. Dkt. 86.	
20	"'[N]eglect' in the context of its subject matter carries the idea of negligence and	
21	not merely of non-action." <i>Pioneer Inv. Services Co. v. Brunswick Associates Ltd.</i>	
22	not metery of non-action. I toneer inv. Service	Les Co. v. Brunswick Associates Liu.

1	Partnership, 507 U.S. 380, 394 (1993) (quoting Klapprott v. United States, 335 U.S. 601,	
2	630 (1949)). In this case, Lawson argues that he was incarcerated when the Court	
3	ordered him to show cause and that his failure to respond should be considered excusable	
4	neglect. Dkt. 86 at 2-5. The Court disagrees. Lawson's failure to communicate with the	
5	Court or respond to any of the multiple documents sent by Defendants was merely	
6	inaction and was not due to circumstances beyond his control. Therefore, the Court	
7	denies Lawson's motion because he has failed to meet his burden to show excusable	
8	neglect.	
9	Dated this 4th day of February, 2013.	
10	l 10	
11	Oby \ Sotto	
12	BENJAMIN H. SETTLE United States District Judge	
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		